

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MAURICE ANTHONY BROWN,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW MURPHY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C23-0835-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 12) of this Court's order dismissing Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice. (Dkt. No. 10.) Having thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court hereby DENIES the reconsideration motion for the reasons explained herein.

Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored. LCR 7(h)(1). Reconsideration is only appropriate where there is "manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* "A motion for reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly." *Ma v. Univ. of S. California*, 2019 WL 1239269, slip op. at 1 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

1 In the instant case, Plaintiff fails to demonstrate manifest error in the prior ruling or a
2 showing of new facts or legal authority, as required by LCR 7(h)(1). Instead, Plaintiff merely
3 reiterates arguments that were already considered and rejected by the Court. (*Compare* Dkt. No.
4 5 at 7–8, *with* Dkt. Nos. 12 at 7–10.)¹

5 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 12) is DENIED.

6
7 DATED this 5th day of October 2023.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John C. Coughenour", is written over a horizontal line.

John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

25 ¹ The Court previously ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint to cure deficiencies
26 identified in his complaint. (*See* Dkt. No. 9.) When Plaintiff failed to do so in a timely manner,
the Court dismissed Plaintiff’s complaint without prejudice. (*See* Dkt. No. 10.) The Court notes
that the untimely amended complaint, attached to Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No.
12 at 2–16), does not cure the previously identified deficiencies.